



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/830,042	04/23/2004	John M. Holt	22216-00003-US1	9699
30678 7590 08/21/2007 CONNOLLY BOVE LODGE & HUTZ LLP 1875 EYE STREET, N.W. SUITE 1100 WASHINGTON, DC 20036			EXAMINER RUTTEN, JAMES D	
			ART UNIT 2192	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 08/21/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/830,042	Applicant(s) HOLT, JOHN M.	
	Examiner J. Derek Rutten	Art Unit 2192	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 May 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9, 11-18 and 20-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-6, 11-13 and 20-23 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 7-9 and 14-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to Applicant's submission filed 5/25/07, responding to the 1/25/07 Office action which detailed the rejection of claims 7-10 and 14-19. Claims 7, 8, and 14 have been amended, claims 10 and 19 have been canceled, and claims 1-6, 11-13, and 20-23 have been withdrawn. Claims 1-9, 11-18, and 20-23 remain pending in the application. Claims 7-9 and 14-18 have been fully considered and examined.

Terminal Disclaimer

2. The terminal disclaimer filed on 5/25/07 disclaiming the terminal portion of any patent granted on this application which would extend beyond the expiration date of U.S. Patent Application serial nos. 11/111,757, 11/111,778, 11/111,779, 11/111,781, and 11/111,946 has been reviewed and is accepted. The terminal disclaimer has been recorded.

Response to Amendment/Arguments

3. The objections to the specification have been withdrawn in view of the amendments filed 5/25/07.

4. The double patenting rejections have been withdrawn in view of the terminal disclaimer filed 5/25/07.

5. The rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph have been withdrawn in view of the amendments filed 5/25/07.

6. On pages 13 and 14, Applicant essentially argues that the Morshed reference discloses a distributed application program in contrast to claim 7 which is directed to "processing a

Art Unit: 2192

corresponding portion of the application program on one of a plurality of computers,” with different portions being “simultaneously executable on each one of the plurality of computers...” Applicant’s arguments are not persuasive. The plain language of the claim simply calls for “processing a portion” on one computer, and simultaneous execution on a plurality of computers. The claim does not contain language that limits any form of distributed computing. Morshed processes a portion on one computer, simply by loading it into memory. Morshed also discloses a client/server implementation of “a distributed application” which provides for simultaneous execution of portions of the application (see FIG. 35 and column 42 line 61 – column 43 line 34). As such, Morshed meets the claim limitations.

7. At the bottom of page 15, Applicant essentially argues that the Scales reference does not disclose “different portions of the application program are substantially simultaneously executed on different computers.” However, Scales discloses a distributed share memory system which is built, as shown in Fig. 2 of Scales, using different computers. Applicant has not persuasively argued that Scales does not disclose simultaneous execution on “different computers.”

Therefore, Applicant’s arguments are not persuasive.

8. At the bottom of page 16 – page 17, Applicant essentially argues in reference to the rejection of claims 17 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. 103 that the Dimpsey reference does not disclose the features of claim 14. However, as discussed above, these features are disclosed by Scales.

9. In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant’s invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., “an application program written to operate on only a single computer” – see middle of page 17) are not recited in the rejected claims. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the

Art Unit: 2192

specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Claim Objections

10. Claims 7 and 14 are objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 7 recites: "A method of loading an application program processing a corresponding portion of the application program on one of a plurality of computers..." This clause appears to have omitted the preposition "by" between "program" and "processing." This is interpreted as a clerical error that should have recited "A method of loading an application program by processing a corresponding portion of the application program on one of a plurality of computers..." A similar issue exists in claim 14 and is interpreted similarly to claim 7. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

11. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

12. Claims 7-9 and 14-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The term "substantially" in line 4 of claim 7 is a relative term which renders the claim indefinite. The term "substantially" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would

Art Unit: 2192

not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention. The term “substantially” is used to describe simultaneous executability of a portion of an application on each of a plurality of computers. However, it is not clear where the threshold for substantial simultaneous executability occurs, and thus the claim is indefinite. For the purpose of further examination, the term will not be considered in the language of the claim. Claim 14 contains similar language in line 4, and is interpreted accordingly as above. Claims 8 and 9 depend from claim 7, and claims 15-18 depend from claim 14 and are rejected for the same reason given above.

13. Claims 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting an essential step, such omission amounting to a gap between the steps. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted step is: loading the application program. Claim 7 is directed to “A method of loading an application program.” However, the program is never actually loaded. Claims 8 and 9 are rejected as being dependent upon a rejected base claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

14. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

15. Claims 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,760,903 to Morshed et al. (hereinafter “Morshed”).

In regard to claim 7, Morshed discloses:

A method of loading an application program <by> processing a corresponding portion of the application program on one of a plurality of computers, See column 20:60-61:

Byte code may be instrumented by instrumenting each class as the class is loaded by the VM runtime system.

the plurality of computers being interconnectable via a communications link, See Figure 29 and associated text in column 32:50-57, e.g. "network";

and different portions of said application program being <> simultaneously executable on each one of the plurality of computers with each one of the plurality of computers having an independent local memory accessible only by the corresponding portion of the application program, See column 34 lines 39-42:

In this example, the COM DLL may be used for facilitating interprocess communication, for example, as between a client and a server as well as between any two server systems.

Also see FIG. 29 and associated text in column 32 lines 50-57, e.g. elements 1000 and 1016a. This figure depicts separate computer systems which Morshed describes in terms of Intel Pentium processors running the MS Windows® operating systems which implicitly provides access to independent local memory by a corresponding portion of software.

the method comprising the step of modifying the application program before execution of said corresponding portion. See column 20:60-61:

Byte code may be instrumented by instrumenting each class as the class is loaded by the VM runtime system

Art Unit: 2192

In regard to claim 8, the above rejection of claim 7 is incorporated. Morshed further discloses: *wherein the step of modifying the application program is different for different computers.* See column 33:28-31, e.g. “different activities.”

16. Claims 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,802,585 to Scales et al. (hereinafter “Scales”).

In regard to claim 14, Scales discloses:

A method of compiling or modifying an application program <by> processing a corresponding portion of the application program to run simultaneously on one of a plurality of computers interconnectable via a communications link See Figure 2 with supporting disclosure in column 4:29-30, e.g. “programs 215 are instrumented”, Also see column 4 lines 18-19: “During operation of the system 200, instructions of the programs 215 are executed by the processors 211.” This passage shows that a portion of the program runs on one of a plurality of computers.

and different portions of said application program being <> simultaneously executable on each one of said plurality of computers with each one of the plurality of computers having an independent local memory accessible only by the corresponding portion of the application program, See column 5 lines 6-8, e.g. “store private data only operated on by a local processor.”

said method comprising the steps of:

Art Unit: 2192

(i) *detecting instructions which share memory records* See Scales column 4:38-42, e.g. “coherency.”

(ii) *listing all such shared memory records and providing a naming tag for each listed memory record* See column 6:20-21, e.g. “table,” and column 11:6-10, e.g. “ID.”

(iii) *detecting those instructions which write to, or manipulate the contexts of, any of said listed memory records, and* See column 4:30-32, e.g. “stores.”

(iv) *generating an alert instruction following each said detected write or manipulate instruction, said alert instruction forwarding the re-written or manipulated contents and name tag of each said re-written or manipulated listed memory record.* See column 1:43-49, e.g. “message passing” and column 32-35, e.g. “miss check.”

In regard to claim 15, the above rejection of claim 14 is incorporated. Scales further discloses: *carried out prior to loading the application program onto each said computer.* See column 4 lines 29-30, e.g. “prior to execution.”

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

17. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

18. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morshed in view of Scales.

In regard to claim 9, the above rejection of claim 7 or 8 is incorporated. Morshed does not expressly disclose further elements of claim 9. However, Scales teaches: *wherein said modifying step comprises:*

(i) detecting instructions which share memory records See Scales column 4:38-42, e.g. “coherency.”

(ii) listing all such shared memory records and providing a naming tag for each listed memory record See column 6:20-21, e.g. “table,” and column 11:6-10, e.g. “ID.”

(iii) detecting those instructions which write to, or manipulate the contexts of, any of said listed memory records, and See column 4:30-32, e.g. “stores.”

(iv) generating an alert instruction corresponding to each said detected write or manipulate instruction, said alert instruction forwarding the re-written or manipulated contents and name tag of each said re-written or manipulated listed memory record. See column 1:43-49, e.g. “message passing” and column 32-35, e.g. “miss check.”

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Scales’ shared memory with Morshed’s loading in order to provide coherency (see Scales column 1:20-26).

19. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scales as applied to claim 14 above, and further in view of Morshed.

In regard to claim 16, the above rejection of claim 14 is incorporated. Scales does not expressly disclose: *carried out during loading of the application program onto each said computer*. However, Morshed teaches instrumenting during loading. See column 20:60-61. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Morshed's teaching of loading with Scales' modification in order to automatically instrument a class instance (see Morshed column 20:61-65).

20. Claims 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scales as applied to claim 14 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication 2004/0163077 by Dimpsey et al. (hereinafter "Dimpsey.")

In regard to claim 17, the above rejection of claim 14 is incorporated. Scales does not expressly disclose: *carried out by just-in-time compilation*. However, Dimpsey teaches just-in-time compilation. See paragraph [0050]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Dimpsey's compiler with Scales' modification in order to increase execution speed while reducing compilation time as inherently provided by just-in-time compilation.

In regard to claim 18, the above rejection of claim 14 is incorporated. Scales does not expressly disclose: *carried out by re-compilation after loading*. However, Dimpsey teaches dynamic instrumentation after loading code. See Abstract. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use

Art Unit: 2192

Dimpsey's dynamic instrumentation in order to minimize system perturbation (see Dimpsey's Abstract). Note that page 9 lines 6-8 of Applicant's specification inform broad interpretation of the concept of "compilation."

Conclusion

21. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. "MultiJav: A Distributed Shared Memory System Based on Multiple Java Virtual Machines" by Chen et al. discloses a distributed runtime system that permits distributed execution of an application designed to run on one computer.

22. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.


Art Unit: 2192

23. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to J. Derek Rutten whose telephone number is (571)272-3703. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Q. Dam can be reached on (571)272-3695. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

jdr



TUAN DAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER